

# REPORT

OF THE FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE

## OHIO STATE ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY,

HELD IN

MASSILLON, STARK COUNTY, OHIO, MAY 27, 1840.

### MINUTES.

Pursuant to notice, the Society met at Massillon, on Wednesday, the 27th inst., at 10 o'clock, A. M. The President and Vice President being absent, the Rev. Samuel Crothers of Highland, was called to the chair, and Robert H. Folger of Stark, Hon. John Godding of Medina, and Eli Nichols of Belmont, appointed Secretaries.

The meeting was opened with prayer by the Rev. Mr. Thomas of Butler.

On motion of Mr. Lee of Harrison, it was

*Resolved*, That all persons present, holding our principles and approving of our measures, be allowed to participate in the deliberations of the meeting, and to vote on all questions that may arise.

On motion of Rev. Mr. Butts of Lorain,

*Resolved*, That the following committees be appointed, to wit:

1st. A committee of seven to present business to the meeting. The Chair appointed Messrs. Bailey of Hamilton; Sutliff of Ashtabula, Irish of Columbian, Butts of Lorain, McGiboney of Knox, Walker of Logan, and Lee of Harrison.

2d. *Auditing Committee*.—Messrs. Osborn of Delaware, Wells of Medina and Cattell of Columbian.

3d. Committee on Ecclesiastical Action.—Messrs. Blanchard of Hamilton, Sage of Stark, Thomas of Butler, Fenn of Trumbull, Bushnell of Hamilton, Mahan of Lorain, Barris of Ashtabula.

4th. On Enrollments.—Messrs. Clapp of Portage, Folger of Stark, and Blodget of Cuyahoga.

On motion of Mr. Weed of Knox, the Annual Report of the Executive Committee was presented and read by its Chairman, Dr. G. Bailey, jr., which was accepted, unanimously adopted, and ordered to be printed.

On motion of Mr. Butts of Lorain, it was

*Resolved*, That those portions of the annual report that relate to the Philanthropist and the employment of agents be referred to a committee of five, to report what in their judgment will be the best means of sustaining the Philanthropist, and extending the present system of agencies.

The chair appointed Messrs. Morgan of Lorain, Shreve of Stark, Reed of Marion, Holliday of Ross, and Benedict of Delaware.

Information being called for, relative to the recent doings of the American Anti-Slavery Society, Dr. G. Bailey read a private letter from Lewis Tappan.

On motion of Mr. Blanchard of Ham., a committee of six was appointed to take into consideration the propriety of calling a convention of Western abolitionists to

be held in Cincinnati, and to name a time. The chair appointed Messrs. Blanchard and Bailey of Hamilton, Butts of Lorain, Donaldson of Clermont, and Barris of Ashtabula.

Portions of a late publication in the Pa. Freeman from C. C. Burleigh, being called for, was also read, reporting the doings of the late meeting of the A. A. S. S. when

On motion, the letter from Lewis Tappan, and C. C. Burleigh were referred to a select committee of ten, Messrs. Dickey, Morgan, Blodget, Morgan, Nichols, C. Donaldson, Payne, Thomas, McNeely, and Benedict were appointed said committee.

On motion, a committee of five on nominations was appointed, consisting of Messrs. Weed, Boyle, Butts, Matthews and Winsans.

On motion adjourned until 2 o'clock, P. M.

#### Afternoon Session.

The Society met pursuant to adjournment.

Mr. Barber, agent of the Ohio Female A. S. S. reported on the condition of colored schools in Ohio.

President Mahan of Lorain, offered the following resolution and moved its adoption.

*Resolved*, That prejudice against color, arising from the condition of the slaves, is one of the main props of slavery, and is the great obstacle in the way of its speedy abolition.

After a most able and interesting discussion, in which the mover, Mr. Pickens of Somerset, Walker of Logan, Weed of Knox, and Guthrie of Muskingum participated, it was laid on the table.

Mr. Morgan from the committee on the letters of Messrs. Tappan and Burleigh, reported as follows—

*Resolved*, That it is inexpedient for this Society, in the present state of our information on the unhappy division of our eastern fellow-laborers, to take any ultimate action on the subject.

*Resolved*, That we deem it proper for the present to act as an independent organization.

On motion, the report was accepted. On the motion to adopt, Dr. Bailey opposed the resolutions, particularly the last, contending that the only proper way to meet the difficulty was, to amend the constitution of the State Society, by striking out that part which makes it auxiliary to the American Anti-Slavery Society. An earnest debate arose, which lasted for some time, when a motion to re-commit, with an addition of six to the committee, prevailed. The following members were added,—Messrs. Bailey, Blanchard, Purdy, Donaldson, Guthrie, and Mahan.

Prof. Mahan's resolution was then taken up and unanimously adopted.

*Mrs. Blanchard*, from the committee on the responsibilities and duties of the church in regard to slavery, reported as follows.

1. *Resolved*, That slavery, a system of false honor and violence, can be overthrown only by the propagation of truth with consistency.

2. *Resolved*, That the end of a church-organization should be, to persuade men to conform to the revealed will of God.

3. *Resolved*, That all church-organizations, refusing to teach and practice, in their respective communities, the truth on the subject of slaveholding, neglect some of the plainest duties of a christian church.

4. *Resolved*, That it is the obvious duty of all ministers and teachers of religion, to explain the application of the word of God to the known practices of men—that they are specially called on to warn the people against prevailing sins, and to expound and enforce such truths and duties as are falling into neglect, according to their respective importance.

5. *Resolved*, That so far as any religious teacher fails in the discharge of these fundamental duties of his calling, he is not worthy to be regarded as a faithful minister of Christ.

6. That free state churches ought not to give to their members, removing to slave states, letters of dismission and recommendation to churches, composed in whole or in part of slaveholders.

7. *Resolved*, That Christian parents ought to use especial care to instruct their children, to regard slaveholding as grossly immoral and wicked.

8. *Resolved*, That the church ought to bear decided testimony against slaveholding, by refusing to admit to membership slaveholders or those who justify slaveholding, and by refusing to listen to those preachers who hold slaves, or withhold the truth on the subject.

9. That the churches of Ohio would promote the cause of truth and righteousness by adopting resolutions expressing the above sentiments, and publishing the same in the public prints.

The report was unanimously accepted and adopted.  
On motion, adjourned till 1-2 past 7 o'clock, P. M.

Half past 7 o'clock, P. M.

The announcement having been made in the afternoon that Messrs. Thomas and Mahat. would address the meeting, Mr. Thomas offered the following resolution.

*Resolved*, That we look upon the anti-slavery movement as a new developement of the spirit of christianity, and a proof that the Bible is the grand source of civil and religious liberty. In support of which Mr. Thomas addressed the meeting at length, and was followed by Prof. Mahan.

Prof. Morgan from the committee to whom was referred the letters of Messrs. Tappan and Burleigh, reported the following resolutions.

1st. *Resolved*, That the first article of the constitution of the Ohio State Anti-Slavery Society be amended by striking out the last clause which reads, "and shall be auxiliary to the American Anti-Slavery Society."

2d. That in making this amendment, we disclaim all intention of censuring the old organization, or approving the new, or expressing any opinion on the merits of the controversy between them.

The report was unanimously accepted and adopted.

On motion, adjourned until 8 o'clock Thursday morning.

Thursday Morning, 8 o'clock.

The meeting was called to order by the President, Prayer by Rev. Mr. Dickey.

Mr. Brooke of Clinton county, offered the following resolution, which was laid on the table.

*Resolved*, That by trafficking in, and consuming the

products of the unpaid toil of the slave, we give a practical support to the system of slavery, and that it virtually justifies the crimes involved by that system.

Dr. Bailey, from the Business committee, reported a series of resolutions on political action, as follows.

1. *Resolved*, That in the opinion of this Convention, the anti-slavery cause has claims upon the citizens of the free states, in a political point of view, paramount to the claims of any of the questions which now agitate political parties.

2. *Resolved*, Therefore, that no voter ought to sacrifice the interests of this cause to the promotion of any party interest whatsoever.

3. *Resolved*, That while we view the question of slavery, regarded politically, as paramount to other political questions, we do not consider it an exclusive one; neither would we undervalue the importance of those questions.

4. *Resolved*, That the question, whether abolitionists shall make themselves felt, politically, by not casting their votes at all, where no candidate in nomination is favorable to their views, or by making a separate nomination, either of which modes of action, they, as citizens, have a perfect right to adopt, is a question of expediency, to be determined in view of circumstances which may vary with time and localities; and that this Convention therefore does not feel at liberty to recommend any general rule on the subject.

5. *Resolved*, That this Convention regards the present anti-slavery organization as primarily a moral one, and must therefore view with disapprobation any attempts made to convert it into a political party, acting, as in such an event it would naturally act, by the ordinary political instrumentalities.

6. *Resolved*, That the want of moral principle and of respect for human rights, evinced in the abject subervience of the candidates for the presidency, of the two political parties, ought to be recognized by the American people as a disqualification for holding any office of influence under a government professing to be founded on free principles. Accepted and laid on the table.

Mr. Wells of Medina, from the auditing committee, reported, that, having examined the accounts of the treasurer, they were found to be correct. The report was adopted.

On motion of Mr. Walker of Logan, the Report of the Business Committee was taken up, but again laid on the table, to make room for the Report of the Committee on the Annual Report, which presented the following resolution.

*Resolved*, That we highly approve the course pursued by the Executive Committee of this Society during the past year for the promotion of the A.S. cause in Ohio.

*Resolved*, That we regard the employment of agents for the dissemination of knowledge on the subject of slavery very by the sale of books, and the voice of the lecturer, as one of the most efficient means of purifying and changing public sentiment, and that we recommend to our Executive Committee to pursue with energy the measures already adopted by them upon this subject.

*Resolved*, That we pledge them our aid and call upon the friends of the cause throughout the State to do the same in defraying the necessary expenses, and in efforts to procure for their agents a hearing. [Report laid on the table.]

Professor Morgan from the Committee on the Philanthropist reported the following resolutions.

*Resolved*, That we approve of the measure of the Executive Committee in striking from the subscription list of the Philanthropist, the names of delinquent subscribers.

*Resolved*, That we approve of the alteration in the size and price of the paper.

*Resolved*, That the ability, good temper, zeal, and faithfulness with which the paper is conducted, render it

worthy of the cordial support of Abolitionists, and of all good citizens.

Accepted and adopted unanimously.

The Report of the Business Committee was taken up, and discussion upon it commenced by a speech from Dr. Bailey. After this speech the discussion was suspended, for the purpose of taking up the report of the Committee on that part of the Annual Report which relates to agencies. The report was adopted, after some animated remarks from several speakers, and the business of taking up pledges and donations attended to.

The Report of the Business Committee was again taken up, and Resolutions 1, 2, 3 and 4 adopted. The fifth resolution gave rise to an earnest debate, which occupied the time till the hour of adjournment.

Afternoon 2 o'clock.

Mr. Crothers having been obliged to return home, Gen. J. H. Paine was appointed president of the convention.

R. H. Folger from the Committee on Enrollment reported that 412 delegates had been enrolled, but that there were besides many more who had arrived, all of whose names it would be difficult to obtain. [Accepted and adopted.]

Mr. Weed from the Nominating Committee reported the following list of officers for the ensuing year.

*President.*

LIECESTER KING.

*Vice-Presidents.*

Samuel Crothers, *Highland*,  
James H. Paine, *Lake*,  
Robert Stewart, *Ross*,  
W. H. Brisbane, *Hamilton*,  
C. G. Finney, *Lorraine*,  
A. A. Guthrie, *Muskingum*,  
Jonas Cattle, *Columbiana*,  
Joseph Stevenson, *Logan*,  
John Hunt, *Athens*.

*Managers.*

L. Ridgen, *Butler*,  
H. J. Curtis, *do*.  
John McIntire, *Crawford*,  
Jno. Anderson, *do*.  
Lester Taylor, *Gauga*,  
Tho. Jones, *do*.  
Zadoc Weeks, *Huron*,  
Wm. Smith, *do*.  
James Porter, *Holmes*,  
Ebenezer Bigham, *do*.  
M. C. Williams,  
Danl. Gilman, *Preble*,  
Shelden Guthrie, *Putnam*,  
Thos. James, *Carroll*,  
C. H. Hayes, *do*.  
G. W. St. John, *Ashtabula*,  
Lucretius Bissell, *do*.  
Horace Nye, *Muskingum*,  
Levi Whipple, *do*.  
Edwin Corner, *Morgan*,  
G. Buckingham, *do*.  
David Eastman, *Fayette*,  
Wm. Cadwallader, *do*.  
I. I. Stone, *Knox*,  
John Trimble, *do*.  
Arva Wales, *Stark*,  
G. W. Warner, *do*.  
Wm. Blackston, *Athens*,  
Harvey Gilmore, *do*.  
F. D. Parrish, *Erie*,  
Danl. Miller, *do*.  
W. W. Beebe, *Fairfield*,  
J. P. Beatty, *do*.  
Thos. Moore, *Carroll*,

*Ross*,

JAMES C. LUDLOW,

THOS. MAYNAR,

J. BLANCHARD,

W. H. BRISBANE,

R. E. PRICK,

H. RUSSELL.

*Corresponding Secretary.*

G. BAILEY, Jr.

*Recording Secretary.*

AUG. HOPKINS,

*Treasurer.*

W. DONALDSON.

[Report adopted.]

Committee on Convention at Cincinnati reported—That it is inexpedient at this meeting to fix the time of said convention. Therefore,

*Resolved*, That the subject of calling a Southern and Western Anti-Slavery Convention be referred to the Executive Committee, with discretionary power to call said convention at such time as they may judge best.

[Adopted.]

The debate on the resolutions of the Business Committee was resumed. Sixth resolution adopted. The sixth was taken up and gave rise to a most excited, decisive, but friendly discussion, which was continued until the hour of adjournment.

Adjourned till half past seven.

*Evening, half past 7.*

Convened according to adjournment. Prayer by Professor Morgan. Address by Mr. Blanchard.

Debate resumed on the sixth resolution of the Business Committee. A motion made to adjourn was lost. A motion to strike out all after the word *resolved*, was lost. The debate was continued on the following substitute proposed by the Rev. Mr. Clark, and the question finally settled by the adoption of the substitute, by a decided vote.

*Resolved*, That subserviency to slavery ought to be a disqualification for any office of influence in the gift of a free people.

On motion it was

*Resolved*, That Dr. Bailey be requested to write out his speech on political action, and publish it in the Philanthropist.

The following three resolutions were moved by Mr. Thomas, and unanimously adopted.

*Resolved*, That in view of the many favorable circumstances which have rendered our meetings agreeable, of the friendly and brotherly feelings which have been manifested in our discussions; of the unanimous decisions to which we have come, on several delicate and important subjects; and especially of the general success and rapid progress of the anti-slavery cause, in our state, during the past year; this Society feels called upon to express its devout gratitude to God, for the many blessings which we believe he has granted us.

*Resolved*, That this Society renders its sincere and heartfelt thanks to the minister, and trustees, and congregation, that worship in this place, for their kindness in granting us the use of their church during the present meetings.

*Resolved*, That the thanks of this Convention be tendered to the citizens of Massillon and vicinity for the hospitalities they have experienced on the present occasion.

After prayer by the Rev. Mr. Avery, the Convention adjourned sine die.

JAS. H. PAINE, Pres't.

R. H. FOLEY,

J. CONDRICK,

ELI NICOLIS.

{ Secret'y's.

FIFTH ANNUAL REPORT,  
of the Executive Committee of the Ohio State  
Anti-Slavery Society for 1839-'40.

Soon after the last Anniversary, the Executive Committee, taking a deliberate view of the history of the anti-slavery cause in Ohio, became deeply convinced of the necessity of devising a more efficient plan of operations, than had yet been adopted. They saw, that from the date of the organization of the state-society, nothing had been done on a scale commensurate with the wants of the state. Every thing was left at loose ends. Nearly all of our most efficient men had been withdrawn from the West. The Parent society was at liberty to occupy the whole field or any part of it, but did little to abolitionize the state, except in the first year of the existence of the state society. There being a divided responsibility, our committee did not sufficiently realize the importance of systematic and permanent action. Too much confidence was reposed in temporary and local agencies, and in the irregular circulation of anti-slavery publications. A vague hope was indulged, that so obviously true were our principles, but a single impulse was needed to secure for them a speedy triumph.

The iniquitous action of the General Assembly of 1838-'39 showed how fallacious was this hope. It showed, that notwithstanding the formation of three hundred anti-slavery societies in our state, the legislative power had become more than ever subservient to slavery, and that the work of abolition must be prosecuted with far more vigorous otherwise, so far from delivering the slave, we ourselves should be compelled to pass under the yoke.

The committee accordingly determined to take the state under their own superintendence, and go to the extreme limit of their ability in supplying it with anti-slavery lecturers.

Rev. L. D. Butts was commissioned as general agent, and his services as such have been invaluable. The Rev. James Boyle was engaged as a lecturer, and travelling book-agent. It was thought that places could thus be supplied with anti-slavery reading that could not obtain it otherwise; and the publications would serve to re-produce in the form of permanent results, the impressions made by the lecturer.—

The plan has worked admirably. A more successful one could not have been adopted. Every where the friends speak in the highest terms of its efficiency. Since last August, beside continually lecturing or debating, Mr. Boyle has disposed of nearly \$1000 worth of our publications, and the demand, so far from being satisfied, has been constantly increasing. Mr. Asa Smith has also been successfully employed in the same way. The eagerness of the people to obtain books and pamphlets is represented as almost incredible.

Arrangements were made last fall for the transfer, of all the agents about to be employed in this state by the American anti-slavery society, to our committee. The committee from that period resolved to undertake independently the conduct of the cause in Ohio. Several other agents were then, and subsequently, commissioned. Within the year they have had twelve agents in their employ, one a lecturer and travelling book-agent, as noted above; one, a travelling book and financial agent; the rest, lecturers. The aggregate times of their services have amounted to 4 years and 6 months; and the sum total of their salaries and travelling expenses has perhaps exceeded \$3000.\* 30 counties at least have been visited, and some of them pretty thoroughly indoctrinated. The labors of our agents have been great, in some instances, extraordinary. All their letters bear testimony to the deep and increasing interest of the people in the great question. Large audiences have generally congregated; debates, prolonged and animated have been frequent; and the spirit of free, bold inquiry has prevailed more than at any former period. There have been occasional

\* Note.—So we read it to the Convention; but it was a mistake. Two friends spoke to us afterwards about it, and said very truly that \$700 a year for a lecturer, which it would seem from the date stated, we had given, was too much for an agent. We assured them that \$600 was the highest salary given, to any one, and that the usual salary was eight dollars a week, that there must be a mistake somewhere—and that we would look at our books when we returned home. On examining our books we found, that we should have stated it thus—and exceeded two thousand dollars. This is strictly the fact. Their united salaries amounted for four years and a half, to between *twenty-one and twenty-two hundred dollars*. We have commenced the year with three agents; our purpose is to increase the number to six.—As a general rule, \$400 is the salary we have resolved to give this year, beside travelling expenses. It is proper to say, that the travelling expenses of our agents have generally been quite light. These facts we deem it proper to state, to satisfy the minds of our hard-working friends, in these hard times.

demonstrations of violence, but on the whole, our lecturers have had to rejoice in the increasing regard of the people for the right of free discussion. Many new societies have been formed, and old ones have been quickened.—Libraries and depositories have been established in various places, constituting permanent centres of light and influence to surrounding neighborhoods.

The plan adopted by the committee for securing support to the lecturers has been quite successful. Different counties have pledged certain sums on condition of receiving an equivalent in the services of lecturers. Others, not demanding an equivalent, have consented that a part of the money raised by them should be appropriated to the support of agents, while laboring in counties, where the cause was yet in its infancy. The liberality and zeal on the part of many of our friends, which have enabled us to maintain such a system of operations, at a period when a hot political warfare and almost unexampled pecuniary distress are conspiring to contract the hearts and purses of men, show a power of principle among Ohio abolitionists which is destined to survive the shock of parties and triumph over all obstacles.

Beside our regular agents, several devoted men, with a generosity worthy of all praise, have given their services gratuitously to the cause of the slave. It is to be regretted that they have not furnished accounts of their labors.

It is the intention of the committee to continue and enlarge their present plan of operations, if they can be assured of the support of the society. The faithful co-operation of every part of our organization is all that is now necessary thoroughly and rapidly to abolitionize Ohio.

The committee are sorry to say, that they have found the utmost difficulty in continuing the publication of the Philanthropist. The weekly receipts during the year have almost constantly fallen short of the expenditures.—The treasurer has been compelled to make advances from his own private resources, and the editor and printer to advance their services to a considerable extent during the year. Our embarrassments have arisen not from a falling off in the subscription list, but from the want of punctuality among subscribers. If but four fifths of these had paid with fidelity, the paper could have been sustained with ease. Two months

since, the committee, concluding to do a safe business or none, determined to adopt, and carry into rigid execution the plan of cash payments. The rule is now, that no subscription shall be received, unless accompanied by payment in advance; and that all those who shall not have paid up arrearages by the first day of July next, shall be struck off from our list. The transition from the old to the new method will of course be attended with inconveniences. There will be many discontinuances, as there have been already, but we believe that there are abolitionists enough in Ohio, too devoted to the cause of human rights, to permit the organ of their state society to sink, under the very effort made to establish it upon a permanent basis. The size of it has been a little reduced, for this, among other reasons, that it may be afforded at two dollars a year. It is now one of the cheapest anti-slavery papers in the Union; and the cheapest weekly of any sort, it is believed, in the West. With 3000 subscribers paying in advance; it would pay for itself, including the editing, and leave a balance for the use of the society. The list of subscribers is now about 3000. Under the new arrangement, it is calculated, that there will be at least six hundred discontinuances, embracing of course those cut off on account of failing to pay up arrearages. The society will perceive at once the necessity of immediate action. Decisive measures ought to be taken to supply the place of these six hundred, by an addition of six hundred paying subscribers. If this increase were solicited, only as an expedient to deliver from present embarrassments, there might be some excuse for a lukewarm response. But, when it is clearly seen that by such an increase, the paper would be placed permanently in easy circumstances, and so far from costing the society any thing hereafter, in the shape of extra aid, it would in fact nett the society no small sum, certainly the Committee feel assured, that this appeal will be promptly and fully responded to.

The Philanthropist is now adopted as the organ of the Illinois, and Indiana State societies. Its usefulness is generally acknowledged.—That the abolitionists of the West must have an organ—that they ought to maintain at least one paper, devoted to the interests of the anti-slavery cause, no one will deny; and that the Philanthropist, from the fact that it has occupied the

ground, has secured a large subscription list, and has an established character among abolitionists, ought to be this organ, will also be admitted. All then that is necessary, is, for the society at the present meeting to make a little extra effort in behalf of its paper. How this may best be attempted, the meeting will decide.

Two things are specially necessary to the steady advancement of our enterprise. They are, the free circulation of anti-slavery periodicals, and a regular system of proselytism or aggression. All moral excitements must have food and exercise. If you withdraw their appropriate stimuli, or divorce them from correspondent action, they will die away, leaving nothing but a corpse-like *sentiment*. If you cease to think, or which is the same thing, to read upon any subject, you will cease to feel; or if you quit acting, you will cease to feel. Not long since an abolitionist requested his paper discontinued, because, said he, "I am now thoroughly anti-slavery!" You would not think that Democrat or Whig a very efficient party man, who should discontinue his party-paper, right in the very midst of the political conflict, on the ground that he was strong enough in his faith. He would be accounted a strange professor, who should sell his Bible, because he was so entirely christianized, that he could do without it.

Why should an abolitionist make it a principal duty to support anti-slavery papers? Because they are necessary to the reformation of the public mind; because, without them, the importance of anti-slavery truth will fade away in his own mind, and the fires of liberty burn low in his own heart; and because, without them, he cannot know how to move in harmony with the great abolition host against slavery. For the sake of reforming others, for the sake of his own integrity, and that he may be enabled to make his efforts against slavery efficient, by uniting them with those of others, he is bound, to support anti-slavery papers. He ceases to take an abolition paper, because he is an abolitionist; will another take it because he is an anti-abolitionist? Can abolitionism be carried forward without the aid of the press? And will the abolitionist, who knows that unless it be sustained, the public mind cannot be reformed, and that without his support, it cannot be sustained, coolly withdraw his subscription because he is anti-slavery enough already?

But, he must take it for his own sake as well as that of others. Congress may strike down constitutional rights; slaveholders may commit fresh outrages on the rights of the free states; lynch-law may invent new modes of violence on our fellow-citizens;—but the man who never reads an anti-slavery paper knows nothing, and cares nothing for these things. Indignation, and shame, and sympathy, and abhorrence, and patriotism, and a sense of duty, and the instinct of self-preservation,—these are the forces which are incessantly brought to bear upon the mind of a reading abolitionist, impelling him to efficient action. The abolitionist who never reads,—at what should he feel indignant? With whom should he sympathize? What is there to awaken his shame, or abhorrence, or sense of duty, or selfishness? Besides—how is he to guard against the wiles of slavery, or unite with others in wise, and concerted movements against it?

Next in importance to the free circulation of abolition periodicals, is the establishment of a regular system of proselytism. Some seem to imagine, that when they have become abolitionists, it is enough—their work is ended. A most pernicious mistake! What is the fig-tree worth, if it produce no fruit? There is a blight upon it, and it but cumbers the ground. The moment a convert is made to abolition, he should begin to work; the moment a society is formed, it should strike out a system of action. A principle, not acted on, will as certainly waste away as an arm unused. Every abolitionist should be a propagandist; the object of every society should be to imbue the community in which it is formed with right sentiments. For this purpose, regular or quarterly meetings should be appointed; monthly concerts of prayer for the oppressed established; and a subscription paper should be stately circulated to raise money, for the support of lecturers, and the purchase of anti-slavery publications, with a view to loaning them, or gratuitously distributing them in the community. In this way alone can an anti-slavery society live. It must die, and it ought to die, if it will do nothing.

A year ago, a fearful apathy was settling down upon the minds of the Abolitionists of Ohio. Various anti-slavery societies had a name to live, while they were dead. (Indeed, to a limited extent, this is the case now.) The

reasons were obvious. Persecution having died away, the reaction occasioned by it subsided. The first impulses of the cause had ceased to act. Nothing but reading, and thereby gaining a view of the enterprise on a great scale, and nothing but systematic aggression, could supply the place of early enthusiasm, and the excitement engendered by persecution. It was owing to a want of the two things we have noticed, that so many societies fell into a languishing condition. About a year since, while receiving returns from anti-slavery societies, we were struck with the vast disproportion between the numbers in membership, and the number of abolition papers circulated among them. In a society, for example, of 132 members, only 3 Philanthropists were taken. The likelihood is, that more than 100 of these abolitionists were in the habit of never reading any anti-slavery paper. In another of 139 members, but one Philanthropist was taken. In nine societies, numbering 810 members, the whole number of Philanthropists amounted to but 16; and scarcely any other abolition periodicals were subscribed for. We put it to the good sense of this meeting—how can abolition be maintained in such societies? By the labor of our lecturers in most parts of the state, abolitionists have been again awakened. There is an abolition revival among us. But impulse cannot supply the place of principle. Lectures are listened to, and will be forgotten, unless their impressions be perpetuated by the reading of anti-slavery publications. And extraordinary meetings will in the end prove fruitless, unless followed up by a steady, well-directed plan of proselytism.

In this connection it should be said, that these agencies are but preliminary. The great object is, to reform public sentiment. But what then? A reformed public sentiment is itself a preliminary—a preliminary to public action through the ballot-box.

The subject of political action in regard to slavery is now an engrossing theme with abolitionists. In the infancy of our enterprise, it attracted little attention. And yet, the political responsibilities of the free states then, in relation to slavery, were as weighty as they are now. But we were too feeble to accomplish any thing through the ballot-box, and our energies were wisely directed into channels where they would prove more productive. As we be-

came numerous, the practicability of operating in a political way, imposed on us a corresponding duty. At first our attempts were very limited, having respect to our ability. It was resolved that it was a matter of deep regret, that the citizens of the free states should aid in the election of men to office, who would trample under foot the great principles of civil liberty. A simple resolution of this tenor, and nothing more, constituted all that the New York State Anti-Slavery Society attempted on the subject at its anniversary four years ago. A little subsequently to this, the plan of questioning candidates began to be agitated, and was practiced in a few places. The requirements of Abolitionists gradually multiplied. Now, they demanded that candidates should express themselves in favor of the right of petition; next, that they should avow their opinions on the constitutional right of Congress to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia; then concerning the duty of this body to abolish it; then, in regard to the power of Congress over the domestic slave-trade; and at length, on all the topics, respecting which it is now the custom in some places to question them. It was a practice which gradually grew up, and prevailed, without plan, without any widely concerted agreement, controlled by no defined principles, and was left to the discretion of Abolitionists throughout the country, to be regulated by them in view of localities and circumstances. As might be expected, results were various, but too often unsatisfactory. Sometimes candidates refused to answer. Sometimes answers partially favorable were returned. Sometimes candidates were not brought out till it was too late to interrogate them. In such cases, Abolitionists having agreed beforehand on no plan to be adopted in view of such results, there was no concordant, conclusive action. Some would vote according to their party-preferences; others would not vote at all; the influence of the whole body was not felt.

About one year since, many of the best friends of the cause became discouraged. They had seen, as they thought, so little good result from the ordinary mode of political action, that they concluded some change necessary.

A Convention was called to meet at Albany. It met in July. What should constitute the standard of abolition-demand, was the main

question discussed. The result is known. Without any reference to places where our enterprise was yet in its infancy, in a state similar to that of the entire cause a few years ago, when Abolitionists scarcely thought of political action, or if they did, limited their requirements to one or two points,—they adopted a resolution declaring that they would not give their suffrages to any candidates for the chief executive and legislative offices in the nation, unless they were in favor of immediate abolition. The other question discussed was, the propriety of a separate political organization. It was debated at some length in the Convention, and then disposed of by referring it to the discretion of the local societies. Whether so designed or not, the resolution with regard to the proper standard of abolition-demand, prepared the way for the abandonment of the common mode of political action, and for the formation of an abolition political party.

The Convention adjourned. In a few months the Rochester Freeman raised the standard of such a party. The arguments of Mr. Holley were republished in the Emancipator, and endorsed by its editor. The editor of the Massachusetts Abolitionist, Elizur Wright, concurred. Then followed Alvan Stewart, and next, Mr. Gerrit Smith, the last, with fear and trembling. John G. Whittier gave his sanction to the movement, and Mr. Birney, it is well known, has been a decided supporter of it since the Cleveland Convention. Meantime the measure has been discussed in our papers; advocated in the Emancipator, Friend of Man, and Massachusetts Abolitionist; opposed in the Liberator, Philanthropist, Herald of Freedom, Voice of Freedom, Michigan Freeman, Charter Oak, Union Herald, &c. The Pennsylvania Freeman under its new editor, is adverse to it; the Christian Witness remains neutral, and the Maine Advocate of Freedom is undecided. It has found very little favor with the great body of Abolitionists. The societies in Massachusetts, Connecticut, Rhode Island, Vermont, New Hampshire, Western Pennsylvania, and the friends generally in Illinois and Indiana have condemned it.

Notwithstanding this diversity of opinion, the advocates of the measure resolved on calling a convention of Abolitionists on the first of April, to discuss the propriety of separate no-

minations for the presidency. The convention consisted of 121 persons, 104 of them from New York State. Five other states were scantily represented. By a vote of 44 to 33 the Convention resolved to make a separate nomination, and Jas. G. Birney and Thomas Earle were selected as the candidates.

The effects of this new movement on the anti-slavery cause in many respects have appeared unfavorable. In the East great division of sentiment prevails with regard to it; and the discussions to which it has given birth are conducted in a spirit not the most favorable to cordial co-operation or a unanimous decision. The excessive zeal of some, it is to be feared, has cooled the ardor of others who have hitherto been devoted friends of our cause. In our own state, these effects are also beginning to be seen.

Refraining from any attempt at argument on the subject, which would bring up the question prematurely before the convention, the committee would remark, that, while the new course of political action proposed for adoption, is *untried*, the old course has in many places been productive of the happiest effects. In Massachusetts the results have been decisive, so far as the legislature is concerned. This year, notwithstanding the intestine broils among the Abolitionists of that commonwealth, the legislature has gone further than at any former period, since the era of abolition, in behalf of human rights. It not only has passed resolutions, solemnly protesting against the gag-rule of Congress, and demanding its immediate repeal; affirming the right of any portion of the people to petition Congress for redress of grievances or what to them may seem such, and the duty of Congress to receive their petitions and respectfully consider them; denouncing the mode of treating abolition-petitions by the Senate, as a virtual denial of the right of petition, and no less despotic, in effect, than the unconstitutional rule adopted by the House; and finally, declaring, that whatever institution or system cannot bear the light of investigation, is manifestly corrupt and dangerous, and ought not to be allowed to exist on a free soil. It not only has passed these stern resolutions by a vote of 396 to 11. It not only has adopted resolutions in regard to the rights of colored citizens of Massachusetts in slave-states. But, it has gone further, and fully responded to the <sup>layers</sup> of

abolitionists, in regard to slavery and the slave-trade in the District of Columbia, &c.; as will be seen by the following resolutions, which are too good to be abridged.

**"COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS.** In the Year One Thousand Eight Hundred and Forty. RESOLVES Relating to Slavery and the Slave Trade, and the admission of new States into the Union.

Whereas, domestic slavery exists in the District of Columbia; under the express authority of Congress, which at the time of the cession of the District, re-enacted the slave codes of Maryland and Virginia; and whereas, the sanction thus given to slavery, and its continued toleration at the seat of Government, form a manifest violation by this nation of the first principles of justice, and have a tendency to corrupt the moral sense, and to lower the character of the whole people of the United States; and whereas, this nation can have no higher interest, either before God or in the eyes of men, than the establishing of justice, and strengthening the just foundations of national honor; and whereas, slavery in the District of Columbia, being thus a national concern, and involving national responsibility, it is the right of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, to remonstrate against the common crime and the degradation of national character; therefore,

Resolved, That Congress ought to exercise its acknowledged power, in the immediate suppression of slavery and the slave trade in the District of Columbia.

And whereas, by the Constitution of the United States, Congress has the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and between the several states of the Union, in the exercise of which power, Congress in the year 1808, abolished the foreign slave trade; and whereas, a domestic slave trade, as unjustifiable in principle as the African slave trade, and scarcely less cruel and inhuman in practice, is now carried on between the several states; therefore,

Resolved, That the domestic slave trade ought to be abolished by Congress, without delay.

Resolved, that no new State ought to be admitted into the Union, whose constitution shall tolerate domestic slavery.

Resolved, That our Senators in Congress be instructed, and our Representatives requested, to use their utmost efforts to give effect to the foregoing resolves.

Resolved, That His Excellency, the Governor, be requested to forward a copy of these resolves to each of the Senators and Representatives from Massachusetts in Congress, and to the governors of the several states, to be by them laid before their respective Legislatures."

But one thing more remains to be done—and that is, the repeal of the law relating to inter-marriages, the last vestige of the slave-code. The measure was attempted this year, and failed only by a very small vote. Another year it will be carried.

All this has been accomplished in a state where the power of Abolitionists is lessened by internal dissensions, under a system of political action, which has been pronounced a total failure!

The anti-slavery action of the New York Assembly is also much in advance of any thing that has been done by it in former years. That

Assembly, self-moved, by a vote of 85 to 10 in the House, and 20 to 4 in the Senate, adopted resolutions protesting against the gag-rule of Congress as an open and direct infringement of the Declaration of Independence, and the Constitution of the United States; and censuring the conduct of that part of the New York delegation in Congress, that voted for it. Subsequently, the Assembly chamber was granted to the New York Anti-Slavery Society, for the purpose of hearing an abolition lecture from Mr. Alvan Stewart. Next, it rejected a resolution disapproving of the movements of Abolitionists. And finally, it has passed a most admirable bill, securing to persons claimed as fugitive slaves, the full benefits of a jury-trial.

All these acts are the fruits of abolition sentiment, brought to bear upon the legislature, by means of that very mode of political action, whose total failure is alleged as a sufficient reason, for the formation of a separate abolition party.

There are three reasons why this mode of political action has been followed by no equally decisive results in Ohio. 1st, Abolitionists in this state are fewer relatively than in Massachusetts, and fewer absolutely than in New York. 2nd, They have not equalled their brethren in those two states in systematic and faithful efforts to bring their principles to bear on the polis. 3d, For two years past, the majority in the General Assembly of this state has belonged to that party, whose uniform policy it is to conciliate the South, by extreme measures against abolitionism. Let us not be misunderstood. We simply state facts. That the policy of the opposition party, should it gain the ascendency, would not be the same in this respect, we do not say. Our only object now, is, to point out the reasons why the common mode of anti-slavery political action has hitherto effected so little in this state.

It is generally agreed that, it is our right and duty to exercise the right of suffrage in such a way as to stamp our principles on the legislation of the country. The great question is, which is the most effectual way of reaching this object. This question cannot safely be settled hastily. The large majority of abolitionists still adheres to the customary mode of political action. A minority, distinguished for zeal, and honesty, and talent, repudiates this mode, and would es-

tablish an abolition political party. The question between them, it is generally admitted, is a question of expediency. Such being the case, it is evident, that the discussion should be conducted in a fraternal spirit, under a deep sense of the importance of maintaining union, without stubbornness on one part, or dogmatism on the other; and that no new, general measure should be rashly attempted, so long as there is hope of uniting the whole body of abolitionists in some conclusive course of action. One thing is certain, however we may distract ourselves and weaken our influence by dissensions, the slaveholders know too well the value of union, not to unite as one man in supporting slavery. Minor differences of opinion they may entertain, but when slavery is in danger, they array in its defence an unbroken phalanx. Their continued encroachments should admonish the friends of liberty, that this is no time to fall out by the way.

Slavery is an abuse; and, inasmuch as an abuse, by its very nature is doomed to destruction, it naturally strives to avoid its fate by bringing the entire power of the government to protect it. It meddles with every question, seeks to control every interest, declares war against every system or principle based on truth, trembles at any action independent of its influence, and boldly announces itself as the cornerstone of our political institutions. 'Whenever,' says a profound French philosopher, 'there is an abuse in the social order, it appears to be the foundation of it, because, being heterogeneous and solitary in its nature, it is necessary for its preservation, that everything should yield to it, that it should be the centre of every thing, and hence that every thing should rest upon it.' This explains why it is, that every department of our national government is under the control of slavery—that the constitution and laws of the country; the Chief Executive, Congress and the Judiciary; state sovereignty and individual rights; the politics, the literature and the religion of the nation, have all been compelled to yield more or less to the power of slavery. The only safety of this enormous abuse is to be found in, universal supremacy. Hence, the process of pro-slavery purification to which our school, and general literature has been subjected; the abject subservience of political parties, especially at the present time, one party, by brawling abuse of

abolitionists, the other by sneaking apologies, caught in the act of maintaining a liberal principle or measure, endeavoring to conciliate the favor of the slaveholder: hence the corruption of the church, & the criminal reluctance of its ministry to rebuke the sin of oppression; the abrogation of the right of petition by the present Congress, its disrespect to sovereign states in refusing to receive the resolves of their legislatures, and many other circumstances, which it is needless to name.

The spirit of domination, growing out of this enormous abuse is specially manifest in the construction put upon the present gag law of Congress.

The rule of the House of Representatives which declares, that no petition, memorial, resolution or other paper, praying for the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia, or any state or territory, or the slave-trade between the states or territories of the United States, in which it now exists, shall be received by the House, or entertained in any way, has been construed by the slaveholding Speaker, so as to exclude

1st. Petitions for the abolition of the slave-trade within the District of Columbia;

2nd. Petitions against the foreign slave-trade;

3d. Petitions in regard to the protection of free people of color in the District, against the legal presumption of their being slaves;

4th. Memorials against the admission of Florida into the Union, as a slave-state.

And that there may be no record of the infamous despotism of this Congress, the Speaker has decided,

1st. That under the same rule, there should be no entry on the journal of the fact that such petitions were presented; and

2nd. That it is not in order for members who present them to move for such an entry.

Never was there a completer, more rigid, and more detestable system of tyranny than that, under which the people of the United States have been deprived of the right of petition.

While slavery thus forbids Congress to entertain even a petition against it, it hesitates not to demand additional favors at the hand of the general government. On the 10th of February three resolutions were introduced into the House by slaveholders, each one contemplating specific

action in behalf of slavery. One was in relation to the Enterprise, and slaves on board of her liberated by the authorities of Bermuda, in consequence of her having been driven into that port by stress of weather. Another related to slaves captured by the Creek Indians, and the expediency of compensating the owners out of appropriations made by Congress. The last contemplated the opening of negotiations with Great Britain for the reclamation of fugitive slaves. Not the slightest objection was made to entertaining these resolutions, but they were received and respectfully treated, as being proper subjects of congressional action. Had the resolution of the legislature of the sovereign state of Massachusetts, protesting against the admission of any new slave state into the Union been presented, she would have been insulted at once by a direct refusal on the part of the House to receive it, or in any way entertain it!

March 11th, Mr. Lumpkins presented in the Senate, resolutions of the Georgia legislature, asking Congress so to amend the laws relating to fugitive slaves, as to authorize the demand for such fugitives to be made upon a federal Judge in the state where they may have taken refuge, and making it the duty of such Judge, on the demand being properly made, to deliver them up. The amendment asked for, if granted, would have deprived the free states of one of the most essential attributes of sovereignty—that of protecting their own citizens. Arrogant and menacing speeches were made by the slaveholders; and, on their demand that the resolutions should be printed, and referred to the Judiciary committee, the motion was sustained without opposition.

On the 4th of March Mr. Calhoun introduced into the Senate resolutions impugning the justice of British laws, which make free every slave the moment his foot touches British soil, no matter how he may have reached there. They also affirmed the right of our government to reclaim slaves who may be shipwrecked on British shores, or driven by stress of weather into British ports. The tendency of the resolutions evidently was to bring this nation into collision with Great Britain on the subject of slavery. Mr. Calhoun was permitted, subsequently, to advocate his resolutions at length.—They were respectfully considered, and unanimously passed, all the whig senators from the northern states, except Mr. Dixon, of Rhode Island, ab-

senting themselves. The right of the American slave-trader to carry on the domestic slave-trade, was hereby substantially affirmed, by the Senate; and their readiness to plunge into a war with Great Britain, at least so far as such resolutions go, was clearly manifested.

Now, how does a sovereign state fare in a more important matter than the loss of a few slaves on a foreign soil; in a matter more vital, than the mode in which the delivery of an occasional runaway slave is to be regulated? One of the resolutions of the legislature of Massachusetts had regard to the protection of colored citizens of that state against certain laws of other states, which imprison them, and reduce them to slavery, if they happen to be within their limits. A breach of the Constitution, a flagrant violation of the rights of Massachusetts are these laws. Certainly she is as much entitled to be heard, speaking through her legislature, in behalf of her citizens, as Mr. Calhoun, vindicating the rights of a few slave-traders, or Georgia, demanding federal legislation in favor of slavery. What are the facts?

*Monday, April 13th, 1840.*

"Mr. Adams having presented certain resolutions of the Legislature of Massachusetts in relation to laws passed by other states, which lead to the imprisonment of citizens of Massachusetts within their bounds, moved their reference to a select committee.

Mr. Andrews, of Kentucky, moved that they lie on the table.

On this motion, Mr. Calhoun, of Massachusetts, demanded the yeas and nays; which being taken, resulted as follows: yeas 102, nays 49.

The resolutions were laid on the table.

The same disposition was made of another resolution of the Massachusetts Legislature, declaring the rule adopted by the House of Representatives excluding abolition petitions, to be in violation of the Constitution:—yeas 105, nays 44."

It is needless to comment on these facts; or to record a multitude of similar outrages. Enough has been advanced to show, that this nation is reduced to a condition of the most degrading vassalage to the slaveholder; that there is but one way peacefully to deliver it, and that is, by well-directed political action—by electing men to office, who will know how, and dare, not only to resist slavery, but to bring the whole force of a rectified public sentiment to bear upon it in all constitutional ways, so as finally to destroy it forever. And surely the evil with which we contend is not so feeble, as to embolden us to waste our energies in conflict with each other, or weaken them by divisions.

Abolitionists have arrived at a dangerous crisis. The administration party, in the West particularly, has racked its ingenuity to discover new modes of manifesting its subserviency to the South, and hatred of abolition. The last legislature of Ohio outstripped its predecessors in this disgraceful policy. Every thing which envenomed malice could suggest and a limited capacity compass, was done, to convince abolitionists that they had no longer any thing to hope from the democratic party. The danger now is, that under the influence of hasty resentment, or a vague expectation of benefit from a political revolution, they may be tempted to compromise their principles in the approaching contest between the parties.

Their duty is clear. It is, to stand independent of parties; to allow themselves to be deluded by vague promises from neither; to maintain their principles at all hazards; to give their support to no candidate for office unless they have conclusive evidence, that he is in favor of reforming the state in regard to slavery. What is the use of a change of power if there be none of principle? A pro-slavery whig is as bad as a pro-slavery democrat. To put down one dishonest man by elevating another, is benefiting nobody. Servility is servility, anti-abolition is anti-abolition, by whomsoever practised. It is not our vocation to avenge our own wrongs; to strive against a party that has abused us, by way of retaliation. Then indeed we might form any alliance however incongruous. The work of abolitionists is, to establish the principles of civil liberty, and procure the repeal of all laws which in any way violate the rights of the colored man, or contribute to perpetuate the wrongs of the slave. No matter how much indignity may be offered to them by one party, so long as the other refuses to give them sufficient ground for believing that it will not do likewise. To support the whig party for the sake of retaliating our injuries on the democratic party, would be irrational and mean; and at the same time, bring our cause into contempt, and our own reputation into disrepute. We must steadily and inflexibly demand submission from both parties to our principles. Nothing can be more reasonable. What are our principles? Are they any thing more or less than what we find recorded in the Declaration of Independence,

the Constitution of the United States, and the Constitution of Ohio?

Whatever changes take place, abolitionism must not suffer; too many important interests are involved in it. No true anti-slavery man, whether whig or democrat, will ever consent to regard the question of slavery as a minor consideration.

#### **REMARKS OF DR. BAILEY,**

##### **ON THE SUBJECT OF POLITICAL ACTION,**

*Made before the Ohio State Anti-Slavery Convention, at Massillon, May 28th, 1840.*

The critical point in our enterprise, has at length been reached. So long as the duties of abolitionists were confined to writing, speaking, giving; to the use of those means which are included under the general phrase—moral-suasion—all was harmony of opinion, and concert of movement. But, when it became a duty to *act*, to act politically, as well as to *testify*, the germs of division began to show themselves. No immediate danger threatened, so long as our societies and conventions contented themselves with *stating some general principles of action*, and merely *recommending* to abolitionists, adherence to them in practice. But, when the matter was taken in hand seriously—when political action began to be insisted upon as a religious duty—when it became manifest, that our conventions were determined to adopt a policy, which would bind every abolitionist to the utter sacrifice of every party-prejudice or interest, should the welfare of our enterprise demand it; then came strife, contention, lukewarmness on the part of some, ultra zeal on the part of others. Then came open division of sentiment, and a loss of mutual confidence, that anguished badly for the cause. Need we say that we are describing an existing state of things?

Now I take it for granted, that there is no abolitionist present, who does not hold, that it is his duty to make his principles felt at the ballot-box. We all are convinced of the propriety, the necessity of political action. But, as to the principles which should regulate this action—here is the dividing point. I believe the division is not so great as by many is supposed. Hitherto, at none of our anniversaries in this state, have we investigated at length, the subject of the political duties of abolitionists. Gen-

eral resolutions have been passed, without however examining the principles on which they were based, or the results to which they might lead. They have been passed, rather as a matter of course, than with a just appreciation of their nature, and a deliberate intention to abide by them in practice. Is it any wonder then, that as the duty of political action presses on us more and more, we should find ourselves without plan, without harmony?

The time has arrived when we must meet the question. It is at length brought, for the first time, fully and fairly under our notice. We are called upon to act with much forbearance, deliberation, candor, caution. Let us bear in mind, that *every principle* must not of necessity be settled at once—every thing be done in this convention, nothing left for succeeding ones. It is the part of wisdom to decide on as many *principles* and *measures* as we can; and to postpone further decisions, where it becomes manifest that they will only end in wrangling and division. We must take it for granted that our brethren are honest; and, that if they cannot be convinced now, they may be next year.

The resolutions\* contemplate a vigorous course of political action, but are intended to be conciliatory. They embrace principles, it is hoped, on which we all can agree; although they may not embrace others, which a few think highly important. They certainly go as far as the state of anti-slavery sentiment in Ohio now renders proper; though not so far as we may find it expedient to go hereafter. The great object is, while we take strong ground now, and prepare the way for still stronger, to maintain union and mutual confidence.

In truth sir, we are in a critical condition. If no platform can be framed on this subject, on which we can all stand, and co-operate, evil must result. I stand here, an advocate of *union*—but a union only upon right principles. If union is to be secured by the sacrifice of the integrity of our cause, by compromising our principles with any reigning party, then welcome division. Twelve men with right principles and *consistent action*, will do more, than thousands who are united in daily violating their own professed principles. It is not the time to indulge in proscription, or push speculative dogmas to ex-

tremes, until we drive off from our association, all practical men; neither is it a time to relax in our duties, as political abolitionists. Let us see, whether, in all the great principles of political action, we are not agreed. I think we are—I am sure we are.—Call to mind the grandeur of our object. Shall the excitements of party warfare raging around us, blind us to the dishonor of our country, close our ears to the clanking of chains in our land, cause us to forget our high vocation? What is our mission? It is, to emancipate a sixth part of our countrymen, deliver our government from bondage to the slaveholding power—as relentless, as it is grasping—re-establish the principles of the Declaration of Independence, wipe away from our nation the reproach of inhumanity, meanness, and hypocrisy, and thus present her to the world, a bright and beautiful example of the greatness that may be attained by a holy regard for human rights, and obedience to God. If, in the fulfilment of this glorious mission, we should be called upon to make sacrifices, shall we not do it? If we are not prepared for self sacrifice, who is? Millions of our fellow-citizens are engaged in taking care of the *common* interests of our country. The welfare of the slave is a matter alien to their sympathies. A profession of regard for this welfare is the tie that binds us together—is the reason why we are here assembled. We are but few—but we are all, who are doing any thing for his interests. Are we not prepared to make a few sacrifices, for his great gain? While nearly three millions of human beings are crushed down under a load of intolerable wrong in our borders, shall we not, if necessary, rejoice in giving up party-attachments and prejudices? We shall not be greatly injured, should our several parties be defeated. But, what hope is there at our hands for the chained and degraded slave, unless we make his cause a paramount one?

I will now make a few explanatory remarks on the resolutions, that have been read, and leave them to the Convention to dispose of.

The first resolution declares, that in the opinion of this Convention, the anti-slavery cause has claims upon American citizens, in a political point of view, paramount to the claims of any of the questions which now divide political parties.

Are there any here who will deny the truth of

\*See resolutions of Business Committee, on Political Action, 2nd page.

this declaration? There may be some—some, who, while they admit that the question, whether three millions of slaves shall be emancipated, transcends in importance all present political questions, yet suppose that we, in the free states, can do so little *politically*, in deciding it, that we may have other political duties of more importance. Were the whole subject of slavery within the jurisdiction of Congress—had this body as much power to abolish the system in the states, as in the District of Columbia, there is no abolitionist on this floor, however indisposed hitherto to political action, who would not at once confess that the question of slavery with us, ought to be the paramount, political question. But there are those who think, that our political connections with slavery on the whole are so slight, that political action in regard to them, may, without sacrifice of principle, be subordinate.

Let us examine this matter. Let us see what are the circumstances from which arise our political responsibilities.

First;—there are our laws against the free colored people, and indirectly supporting slavery,—laws, which deprive them of the benefit of a jury-trial, in those cases where it is most needed; which license and invite the commission of violence and fraud on their persons and property, degrade their character, and wound their feelings, by forbidding them to bear testimony against a white man; which condemn them to ignorance by excluding them from the benefits of the common-school fund; which humiliate, and insult and vex them by presuming them slaves, and making them pay for freedom-certificates; which punish our citizens with heavy fines or imprisonment, for obeying the dictates of humanity and commands of God, in extending mercy to the outcast and wanderer; which make it obligatory on all officers of the law to recognize slavery in the slave states, without proof,—and there too, is the organic law of the state, which deprives colored people of the right of suffrage, because of their color, while their property is taxed—thus violating the very principle which constituted the chief ground and justification of our rebellion against Great Britain. Now here is a goodly catalogue of laws, for a state professing to be republican and christian. Are they not gross transgressions of the principles of our constitution—palpable and ex-

traordinary contradictions to the doctrines on which our national and state-existence is predicated? Are they not wanton invasions of human rights—loathsome developments of hatred against the poor and helpless—bold infractions of the law of God, which commands us to love our neighbor as ourselves? and do they not convict us at once of hypocrisy and malice? These laws are made by *us*—their meanness and wickedness cover *us* with disgrace—on *us* rests the responsibility of their repeal. Now, we may delude ourselves, if we please, by false reasoning,—still, it will be no less true, that no prospect of party, pecuniary, or other interest, however great, will justify us in adjourning the question of redressing wrongs we are inflicting on a neighbor. If I am called upon to decide between doing a plain act of justice now, or putting it off, until I shall have done some act advantageous to myself, how shall I decide? Which ought I to postpone—a question which regards my own interests or the interests of my party, or a question which concerns the redress of certain wrongs I am inflicting on a brother man? Can any expected good to myself whatever, justify me in delaying justice to him whom I have wronged? Every man's conscience answers. No personal or party-interest whatsoever, can excuse the adjournment of a question of right and wrong. The question then of the repeal of the legislation of this state against colored people, is paramount, and ought not to be postponed.

The same reasoning holds good in the case of slaves held in the District of Columbia, and the domestic slave-trade. Some of you may have noticed in the papers a few months since, astounding developments in regard to the extent of this traffic.—90,000 slaves imported into Mississippi in the space of three years—every hill-top covered, every village surrounded with the tents of the trafficker in human blood and bones! Have you ever estimated how many families must have been broken up, how many tender ties torn asunder, how many hearts broken, how many mothers left childless, how many wives, widows, how many wailings must have gone up into the ears of the God of the oppressed, while this brutal traffic was in progress? Whom will God hold accountable for this murderous traffic—for the inconceivable anguish it has brought upon the poor and defence-

less? Those, who have the right and the power to put it down—the people of the free states, no less than the abandoned slave-traders. For it is clearly within the power of our citizens by their votes to put an end to this wickedness. How is it possible that we can persuade ourselves that God will hold us guiltless, so long as we subordinate a question of such vital importance to questions of political economy?

Look further at our peculiar constitutional connections with slavery in the South. These are of such a character, as to involve us in guilt, political degradation, and extreme peril.

The law of God, and of nature, commands us to bearay not the innocent, not to deliver up the slave to his master, not to join with the wicked man in his oppression. The Constitution of the United States requires us to give up to bondage, one whom we know is entitled to liberty by the same charter which secures it to us—to give our sanction to oppression.

Every sentiment of justice and humanity cries out against the damning iniquity, of aiding guilty might against rebellious right—despotic power in its efforts to re-establish oppression over those who, appealing to the God of the oppressed, have riven their chains, and solemnly pledged themselves to die, freemen, rather than live slaves. That detestable act, from which our nature recoils in horror, the constitution enjoins upon us as a duty. The free states in fact, are compelled to stand sentinels over slavery. It is hardly too strong language to say—that it exists now, mainly by force of the provisions in the constitution, which secure for its protection, the power of the whole nation.

But, sir, these connections politically degrade us. We at the North are represented in Congress, according to our numbers. Slaveholders are represented according to their numbers, and the amount of their slave-property. 25 representatives on the floor of Congress represent slave-property. Take one or two facts, as illustrative of the inequitable bearings of the ratio of representation fixed in the Constitution. New Jersey, with a free population of 318,568, has only six representatives in Congress, and eight votes for President; and her portion of the surplus revenue was \$1,019,560, or \$3 20 to each free inhabitant of the state; while Georgia, with a free population of only 209,292, has 9 representatives and 11 electoral votes, and received of

the surplus revenue \$1,401,896, or \$4 80 to each free inhabitant. Two freemen of the South, are equal to three freemen of the North. Ohio, with as many voters, within nine, thousand, as Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, and Mississippi put together, has not one-third as many electors or representatives, as those states. One slaveholder in them, has as much political power, as about three of the hard-working freemen of Ohio! Is not this *degradation*? Now I confess, this simple fact, when I consider its gross injustice, and the disastrous influence it has exerted over the independence of the free states, humbles me, vexes me, fills me with deeper indignation, than all the folly and misrule that have been charged on the present Administration, or any preceding ones.

But sir, I am not yet done. This government is now used, and has been used by the slave holder to promote the interests of slavery at home and abroad. With a population not half so great as that of the free states, the South has given us our Presidents and Vice Presidents, and for the last 20 years, the speakers of the House of Representatives. It has filled our chief executive offices, and our cabinets. It has controlled the policy of the government, in relation to almost every public question. It has compelled the government to urge with disgraceful pertinacity, claims for slave-property, negotiations for the surrender of runaway slaves—and this too, in such a way, as to annoy and vex other governments, exciting at once their contempt and indignation. In all things, and nearly at all times, the slaveholding interest has been the predominant, controlling element in our government.—In view of these facts, is there a man that feels for the honor of his country, regards its welfare, and has a proper abhorrence of slavery, and slave-holding arrogance, who will not concede, that the question of slavery, even in a political point of view, ought to be the paramount question with the American people?

Look further at the *perils* to which this reigning influence subjects us. I allude not now to the weakness of our southern border—the rapid growth of a population in our midst, alien, ignorant and degraded; one in origin, feeling, and habits with the emancipated colonists of the West Indies; ready in case of war with a foreign enemy, to rush to the standard of an invader.—

I speak of the aggressions already committed on your rights by the slaveholding power. Look at its attempts—first to stimulate public opinion to the justification of lynch-law—next to use executive power to stir up popular fury, and to suggest penal laws against our enterprise—next to violate the privileges of the post office—next to destroy freedom of debate in Congress, and the right of petition—finally, to ride over the sovereignty and institutions of the free states, by congressional provisions in favor of the slave-holder who may wish to carry his train of human chattels with him to the North. You know how entirely successful these attempts have been in many cases. You knew, that in congress at this time, there is not one jot or tittle more of the right to discuss freely, than the slave-holder allows—and that *the right of petition is not*. What soul here was not startled, when the intelligence first reached it, that the Congress of the United States, in obedience to the slave-holder's mandate, had madly violated the plain letter of the constitution, in denying a right, which the meanest subject under the meanest despotism can exercise with freedom? From the past, judge of the future. From the attempts made, from the acts done, tremble at the prospect of the outrages, which such despotism, unchecked, unsubdued, may yet perpetrate. What is there, in the movements of any political party, (unconnected with the slavery-question,) which ought to excite so much alarm and disquietude, as the usurpations of this slaveholding power?

Once more, sir,—has the abolitionist, who has hitherto doubted the truth of the declaration contained in this resolution, weighed well the effects of consistent political action against slavery on the part of the free states? Suppose the legislation of these states, which now oppresses the free colored man, and countenances slavery by endorsing the principle on which it is founded, were all repealed—suppose slavery in the District of Columbia, and the domestic slave-trade were abolished—suppose it were impossible henceforth, for any state whose constitution tolerated slavery, to obtain admission into the Union—suppose no slave-holder could be elected President or Vice President of the United States—suppose all executive offices were filled by men, pledged to do nothing more for the protection of slaveholding interests,

than the constitution rigidly enjoined—suppose the people of the free states, as with one voice, should demand the amendment of those parts of the constitution which in any way recognize the evil,—how long could the system stand? Now all these changes lie within the constitutional power of the citizens of the free states. But, they never can be effected, except through political action—and who shall commence such action, if not abolitionists?

These considerations, sir, it strikes me, are sufficient to prove the truth of the first resolution.

The second resolution declares, that no voter ought to sacrifice the interests of this cause to the promotion of any party-interest whatsoever. This needs no remark. If the truth of the first resolution be admitted, the truth of this must follow of course.

The third resolution is intended to guard against misrepresentation. It assumes, that while we view the question of slavery, regarded politically, as paramount to other political questions, we do not consider it an exclusive one; neither would we undervalue the importance of these questions.

Abolitionists, I think, have erred, in disparaging the objects and principles of party. It is certainly assuming to ourselves too much, to charge our countrymen, universally, with contending about nothing—or, worse than nothing, the spoils of office. From the conduct of a few, we have no right to infer the character of whole masses. I have no doubt myself, that the questions at issue between the two parties, are of great importance—that there is much truth on both sides—that on both sides is a large amount of sincere attachment to principle, and devotion to what each supposes to be, the welfare of the country. Far be it from me to insult my fellow countrymen, or to throw contempt upon the great subjects of political economy about which there is so much diversity of opinion. That there are multitudes of hollow-hearted, ambitious wretches, who take advantage of the honest zeal of the people, to ride into power, and riot in the gains of office, we know. But, all are not demagogues. The mistake is, in giving undue importance to question of political economy, and modes of administration—in placing these above questions which involve primarily, great and fundamental rights—without the full recognition and pro-

tection of which, there is no sure basis for economical welfare.

Of course, sir, I consider it unwise to war against parties, as such. Our mission is, not to exterminate, but reform—not to prove that there is nothing of any consequence in the world but slavery, but that this question ought to be paramount to all party-questions now agitating our country. What may be the ultimate influence on present party-divisions, of the recognition of this great fact by the public mind, it is not for me to say.

The fourth resolution touches an important subject, but leaves it expressly for the decision of abolitionists individually. It is obvious that the question, whether abolitionists in certain cases, shall simply withhold their votes, or bestow them on candidates nominated by themselves, is a question which they have a right to settle for themselves, as American citizens. No convention—no party has any right to bind them in this matter. It is a question, the decision of which to a great extent must depend upon circumstances, that cannot now be foreseen. Suppose a county in which were four thousand voters, pretty equally divided between the two parties, and that one-fourth of the whole number were abolitionists. Candidates are brought out, adverse on all points to the cause of human rights. The duty of abolitionists, in such a case, I think, would be plain,—let them withhold their votes. But, what should they do with them? For one, I am not prepared to decide; and so many circumstances, impossible to be known by this convention, would have to be taken into the account, in making up a judgment, we cannot decide, whether it would be better to start another nomination, or simply stay away from the polls. Either kind of action, harmonized in by all, would secure the desired result—a better nomination at the next election. As to which would be the safer and more efficient plan, abolitionists on the spot would be the best judges. One thing, however, I am sure of—no signal movement in a political way, ought now to be attempted, unless union among abolitionists can be calculated upon—much less, when it threatens to end in irretrievable division.

I come, sir, to the last resolution, which contemplates the present anti-slavery organization, as *primarily*, and *strictly a moral one*, bound in

view of its own constitution, its repeated professions, and its great object—the abolition of Southern slavery—to act by strictly *moral means*.

By moral means is meant, the publication of facts, arguments and appeals, calculated to enlighten the understanding, convince the judgment and awaken the conscience and humanity of the nation on the subject of slavery—all such means, in short, as are recognized as legitimate by other associations of a similar character. The resolution would have the convention further affirm, that it views with disapprobation any attempt to convert our organization into a political party. It should be remarked, that it does not touch the question of a political party, organized on anti-slavery principles, independent of our organization. This question it leaves to abolitionists in their citizen-capacity, to be determined in the light of experience. The resolution simply is intended to guard our *present* moral organization, and preserve it free from the perils of *political strife*. Such an organization is evidently required, to disseminate truth, determine principles, maintain a pure standard of faith and policy, and exalt the tone of the nation on the subject of human rights. It is required, as an organ, through which the moral and religious voice of the nation may be addressed to the ear of the South.

Mr. President—to those who are enemies to political action and imagine that every thing is to be accomplished by public sentiment, I would address myself for a few moments.

The average moral character of men holding executive and legislative offices under our national government, from a period not long subsequent to its establishment, has been almost uniformly below the average morality of the nation. Generally, men are sent to congress and our state legislatures who, in point of capacity, good manners, and moral principle, sadly mis-represent their constituents. Who does not know, that the acts of our present congress and preceding ones have dishonored the nation, excited the derision of Europe, and furnished the advocates of despotism with new arguments against the democratic principle? And what Ohioan does not blush, when he calls to mind the moral composition of the last two legislatures of this state? The violence, vulgarity and immorality of American representatives have passed into a proverb.

Take another fact. The public sentiment of this country from the date of the adoption of the constitution, until a few years since, was indisputably, unfriendly to slavery. Still this system rapidly enlarged its boundaries, multiplied its victims fourfold, set at nought all the influences, which it was supposed would overthrow it, laid its hand on the government, and became at length powerful enough to fill the highest seats, and control the disposal of nearly all offices of national trust and power. In spite of an opposing *public sentiment*, two or three hundred thousand slaveholders, united by the strong bond of a common interest, contrived to impose their yoke on the nation, and give law to the government.

Again. Public sentiment in this country has always been hostile to intemperance. But, what availed it? Steadily and rapidly until within a short period, did this evil grow up, gathering strength every year, scattering its curses broadcast through the land, until, despite an adverse public sentiment, it threatened ruin to our country.

Sir, *these are facts*. What is their explanation? It is this. Public sentiment in favor of morality, or against any particular evil, accomplishes nothing, can accomplish nothing, so long as it remains a *mere sentiment*. You must organize it, you must make it a *living principle*, you must transform it into *action*; you must make sentimentalists, *actors*, before you can make it *effective*. Evil is an ever-active principle, always aggressive. You must meet it with action, with aggression, or your mere sentiment will collapse under its power.

Had all who were *sentimentally* in favor of good morals, made their sentiment a principle of action from the beginning, and steadily agreed in bestowing their votes only upon moral men, think you that congress and our state legislatures would have been what they now are?—Had every body opposed in *sentiment* to slavery, *acted out* his sentiment, and always rejected sternly the claims of pro-slavery or slaveholding candidates, the name and necessity of a modern abolitionist would never have been recognized. Mere sentiment of itself does not lead to action. Sentiment and action in our case have contradicted each other. This is why the practice of our government contradicts the theory. This is why the “*freest nation on earth*” at once inflicts

and suffers a slavery, pre-eminently oppressive and disgraceful.

For many years past, the people of Cincinnati have been convinced, that the existence and increase of coffee-houses amongst them were a great evil. Public sentiment clearly condemned them. But, it was *unorganized*, and therefore *inactive*. Bad men, though in a decided minority, were united and active. They kindly saved their better neighbors the trouble of electing the officers. Always present at political meetings, never absent from the polls, they loved to rule over others, in proportion as they were unable to rule their own spirits. Political noise, and intrigue, and influence, and notoriety suited their taste. Besides, they were interested in having just such legislation as would not interfere with their vices. Many of them contended earnestly for the precious privilege of getting drunk themselves, and making others drunk, with the least possible expense. Good men *thought*, and *felt*, and *talked* against the coffee-house system. But they were not ambitious. No matter who filled the offices, they got along very well. Coffee-houses *might* be licensed—they were not compelled to drink. They had their own affairs to attend to—were busied in contributing to the wealth of the community, or in plans of private benevolence, or in religious enterprises. Power they cared nothing about, and the uproar and trickery of an electioneering day disgusted them. They forgot, that “when the righteous are in authority, the people rejoice; but when the wicked bear rule, the people mourn.” So, although a large majority, they either neglected to vote at all, or made a choice of evils from the corrupt candidates imposed upon them by an unprincipled minority.

At last, sir, the Genius of Temperance raised its voice. The alarm was sounded. Temperance agents, temperance prints, temperance meetings soon convinced the people of the ruin about to come upon them—and that good men, sober men must *act* as well as *feel*—must *act through the ballot box*, and wrest the government of the city from the hands of the depraved few. The crisis came. Temperance men were put in nomination, elected by triumphant majorities, and the coffee-house system fell. Had the good men of Cincinnati acted from the beginning, as well as *felt*, how much poverty, and wretchedness, and crime would have been prevented! But

mark! Even now, so sleepless is the Evil One, so insidious in his wiles, so determined in purpose, so single-eyed in his zeal for rum, that in a city, where three-fourths of the people are hostile to coffee-houses, the utmost effort is demanded to prevent a renewed growth of them.

This case illustrates what has happened time and again, all over the country. It shows how an odious usage or practice may grow up steadily under the eye of an *adverse public sentiment*; how it rallies round itself and organizes in its defence, all the worst elements of society; and how, by the aid of a most miserable, meagre minority, it may yet secure itself in the heart of a hostile community, under the very wing of the law! It teaches too the true mode in which public sentiment is to be made *effective*:

The ballot-box, sir, must be regarded as a great moral instrumentality. It is certainly a formidable instrument; and if good men do not use it for good, bad men will use it for evil.—Ought we, believing as we do, that civil government is an ordinance of God, abandon it to the control of the Devil? Moral and religious men must learn to appreciate the solemn obligation of their duties as citizens, and in the bestowment of their votes, act in view of the interests of morality, and under a deep sense of responsibility to God. What is the use of a free government, if the morality of a free people is no to give it tone and character? Better, far better, be under the control of a *single* bad man, than in subjection to a hydra-headed monster of iniquity. Church and State are divorced in our country. I am glad of it. The kingdom of Christ does not depend on human legislation. I would not have government attempt to legislate over the consciences of men, or *legislate* them into religion. But, while good men seek no legislation in support of religion, let them suffer none, in favor of irreligion and immorality. While they justly spurn the authority of human edicts *over* the conscience, let them tolerate no legislative outrages *against* the conscience. When will this moral, free people learn, that they cannot divorce their religion and their politics? Does not the same moral law bind them in the bestowment of their votes, in the exercise of their political duties, as in the performance of any other duties? Do they lay aside their character, as moral agents, when they stand at the ballot-box? Do they not know, that legislation

in its course often involves high moral principles, great questions of right and wrong; and that it can be made, and will be made, subservient to wickedness, unless they prevent? How is it possible then, for them to cast their votes for men, who, they know, will throw their influence on the side of rum-drinking, slaveholding, or some other crime?

Slavery in the South and in the District of Columbia, the domestic slave-trade; the oppression of the free colored man, and the countenance and support given to slavery, in the free states, are all moral evils, upheld by legislation, which contravenes God's law. By legislation sir, they must be abolished. Our business is, not only to destroy the slaveholding spirit—to obtain a decision of the *public sentiment* against these evils. This is but preparatory. *Political action* must consummate the work. Wicked legislation must be repealed and substituted by such laws, as shall secure to the oppressed their rights. We all calculate on such action among slaveholders. But have *we* nothing to do? Is there no criminal legislation for which we are responsible? Where are our black laws, our laws in favor of slavery, our responsibilities in regard to slavery at the seat of the national government, and the inter-state slave-trade? Where, our responsibilities in regard to the fundamental rights of free discussion, and petition, which year after year are invaded by Congress? Are we to *think* and *feel* away these evils? Or, is it by *action* they must be remedied? Think you, that if *we* do not commence political action against them, it will ever be commenced? Recollect the three facts to which allusion has been made. Public sentiment, I repeat, in this case must become public *action*, or it is worthless. Water corrupts by stagnation. Iron rusts for want of use. Inaction destroys health. Principle, unacted on, wastes away. Good and evil, liberty and slavery, are antagonist principles. Evil never sleeps, but goes about like a roaring lion, seeking whom it may devour. If the good man permit his good to sleep, evil will come upon it, and take it captive. If good principles are to triumph, they must be acted out, in every legitimate way. Only on such condition, can truth conquer—only on such condition can liberty annihilate slavery. All our moral suasion is but preparatory. The suasion of right voting in

In the question of strict discipline in the church, must decide the question.

Who then will not act? Sir, to God and man we stand pledged to use all proper means for the overthrow of slavery. We move on a broad theatre. The eyes of the world are turned towards us. The spirit of the age is upon us; the philanthropists of Europe cheer us onwards; the conscience of the slaveholder is witness; the cry of the slave is ringing in our ears; the whole earth is moved; the heavens are alive with the sounds of liberty to the captive, shout!

for the God of the oppressed has come down to break in pieces the rod of the oppressor, and deliver the poor out of his hand! Amid such a scene, can we remain unmoved? Is there nothing in it to exalt us above all local and temporary questions? There is. We feel, I am sure, the inspiration of the age. Henceforth then, let us resolve to *act*—act for the slave, as we would for ourselves—seeing it is God who has called us to be co-workers with him in establishing upon an indestructible basis, the right of every human being to the ownership of himself!

## TREASURER'S ANNUAL REPORT.

Ohio State Anti-Slavery Society in account with WILLIAM DONALDSON for year commencing May 18th, 1839, and ending May 16th, 1840.

### DISBURSEMENTS.

p'd. Editor of the Philanthropist, and Corresponding Secretary,	\$859 75
" Publishing Agent,	450 09
" Agents and Lecturers' Salary & Expenses,	1212 06
" Printing Philanthropist, Reports, &c.	2131 00
" For paper,	1874 60
" Anti-slavery books & pamphlets,	1379 86
" Rent of office, 14 years,	187 50
" Ice expenses, for stationery, fuel, postage, assistance, &c. per acre,	445 54
" W expenses,	121 36
" Uncurrent & counterfeit money,	45 68
" Interest,	24 20
M. R. Robinson, donation at the last Convention,	100 00
	<hr/>
Credits,	8831 74
	<hr/>
Balance due the Treasurer,	\$69 05

### RECEIPTS.

Cash on hand on last settlement,	\$19 11
" Received on Pledges and Donations,	2509 39
" " for uncurrent money sold,	2 50
" " for Mr. Mahan,	25 00
" " on suit against Cincinnati Mobi- cocrate,	1219 36
" " for colored schools,	10 00
" " for Philanthropist,	2821 97
" from Depository,	1369 60
	<hr/>
" from Mr. Dearlove, May 18,	7974 93
" at Massillon Con'n." 30,	30 00
	<hr/>
	735 76
	<hr/>
	8742 69

\* Owing to the plan adopted, of making our lecturers dependent on the county societies, within whose limits they labor, all the monies paid agents, &c. do not appear in our Treasurer's book, because they have not been reported by the societies. About \$1200, we presume, have not been reported. This would make the actual receipts and expenditures of the Society, about eleven thousand dollars.